

Fast Reachable Set Approximations via State Decoupling Disturbances

Mo Chen*, Sylvia Herbert*, and Claire J. Tomlin

Abstract—With the recent surge of interest in using robotics and automation for civil purposes, providing safety and performance guarantees has become extremely important. In the past, differential games have been successfully used for the analysis of safe-critical systems. In particular, the Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) formulation of differential games provides a flexible way to compute the reachable set, which can characterize the set of states which lead to either desirable or undesirable configurations, depending on the application. While HJ reachability in theory is applicable to many small practical systems, the curse of dimensionality prevents the direct application of HJ reachability to many larger systems. To address computation complexity issues, various efficient computation methods in the literature have been developed for approximating or exactly computing the solution to HJ partial differential equations, but only when the system dynamics are of specific forms. In this paper, we propose a flexible method to trade off optimality with computation complexity in HJ reachability analysis. To achieve this, we propose to simplify system dynamics by treating state variables as disturbances. We prove that the resulting approximation is conservative in the desired direction, and demonstrate our method using a 4D plane model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Optimal control problems and differential games are important and powerful theoretical tools for analyzing a wide variety of systems, especially ones which are safety-critical. They have been extensively studied in the past several decades [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], and have been successfully applied to practical problems such as pairwise collision avoidance [5], aircraft in-flight refueling [8], vehicle platooning [9], and many others [10], [11]. With the recent growing interest in using safety-critical autonomous systems such as autonomous cars and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) for civil purposes [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], the importance and necessity of having flexible tools that can provide safety guarantees have substantially increased.

Intuitively, in an optimal control problem, one seeks to find the cheapest way a system described by an ordinary differential equation (ODE) model can perform a certain task. In a differential game, a system is controlled by two adversarial agents competing to respectively minimize and maximize a joint cost function. Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) reachability is a common and effective way to analyze both optimal control problems and differential games because of

the guarantees that it provides and its flexibility with respect to the system dynamics.

In a reachability problem, one is given some system dynamics described by an ODE, and a target set which describes the set of final conditions under consideration. Depending on the application, the target set can represent either a set of desired or undesired states. The goal in reachability analysis is to compute the backwards reachable set. When the target set is a set of desired states, the backwards reachable set represents the set of states from which the system can be guaranteed to be driven to the target set, despite the worst case disturbances. In contrast, when the target set is a set of undesired states, the backwards reachable set represents the set of states from which the system may be driven into the target set under some disturbance, despite its best control efforts to prevent this from happening.

Because of the theoretical guarantees that reachability analysis provides, it is ideal for analyzing the newest problems involving autonomous systems. However, in order to compute the backwards reachable set, an HJ partial differential equation (PDE) must be solved on a grid representing a discretization of the state space. This means that the complexity of computing a backwards reachable set grows exponentially with the number of system states, making the standard HJ reachability formulation intractable for systems with higher than approximately five dimensions.

To address this difficulty, a number of approximation techniques have been developed, such as those involving projections, approximate dynamic programming, and occupation measure theory [17], [18], [19]. When the system dynamics satisfy certain assumptions, a small number of algorithms can perform computations in a space with fewer dimensions than the full state space, substantially improving computation efficiency without sacrificing optimality [20], [21].

In this paper, we propose a method to remove coupling in systems by treating coupling variables as disturbances. This uncoupling of dynamics transforms the system into a form that is suitable for analysis using methods such as [20] and [21], which exploit system structure. We show that our approach results in reachable sets which are conservative in the desired direction – either under- or over-approximations, and demonstrate the performance of our method when combined with the decoupled formulation in [21].

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a differential game between two players described by the time-invariant system with state $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ evolving according to the ordinary differential equation

This work has been supported in part by NSF under CPS:ActionWebs (CNS-931843), by ONR under the HUNT (N0014-08-0696) and SMARTS (N00014-09-1-1051) MURIs and by grant N00014-12-1-0609, by AFOSR under the CHASE MURI (FA9550-10-1-0567). The research of M. Chen has received funding from the “NSERC PGS-D” Program.

* Both authors contributed equally to this work. All authors are with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California, Berkeley. {mochen72, sylvia.herbert, tomlin}@berkeley.edu

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{z} &= f(z, u, d) \\
t &\in [-T, 0] \\
u &\in \mathcal{U} \\
d &\in \mathcal{D}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where u is the control of Player 1, and d is the control of Player 2. For many applications, u and d are regarded as the control and disturbance, respectively, of a system described by (1). We assume $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is uniformly continuous, bounded, and Lipschitz continuous in z for fixed u, d , and the control functions $u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{U}, d(\cdot) \in \mathbb{D}$ are drawn from the set of measurable functions¹. As in [1], [2], [5], we allow Player 2 to only use nonanticipative strategies γ , defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma \in \Gamma &:= \{\mathcal{N} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \mid \\
&u(r) = \hat{u}(r) \text{ a. e. } r \in [t, s] \\
&\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}[u](r) = \mathcal{N}[\hat{u}](r) \text{ a. e. } r \in [t, s]\}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Suppose that the state can be written as $z = (x, y)$ such that the control u and disturbance d can be written as $u = (u_x, u_y), d = (d_x, d_y)$, and such a decomposition of the control leads to the following form of system dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= g(x, y, u_x, d_x) \\
\dot{y} &= h(x, y, u_y, d_y) \\
t &\in [-T, 0] \\
u_x &\in \mathcal{U}_x, u_y \in \mathcal{U}_y \\
d_x &\in \mathcal{D}_x, d_y \in \mathcal{D}_y
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}, n_x + n_y = n$, and g, h are the system dynamics in the x and y components. Note that this assumption on u and d is a mild one, and is satisfied by any system in which the each of the control components u_x, u_y and disturbance components d_x, d_y has independent control sets $\mathcal{U}_x, \mathcal{U}_y$ and disturbance sets $\mathcal{D}_x, \mathcal{D}_y$, respectively; note that we can also write $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_x \times \mathcal{U}_y$, and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_x \times \mathcal{D}_y$. This decomposition is very common in real world systems, where control input bounds such as maximum acceleration and maximum turn rate are independent of each other.

For the system in the form of (3), we would like to compute the backwards reachable set (BRS) $\mathcal{V}(T)$ of time horizon T . Intuitively, $\mathcal{V}(T)$ is the set of states from which there exists a control strategy to drive the system into a corresponding target set $\mathcal{L}$ within a duration of T . Formally, the reachable set is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}(t) &= \{z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{U}, \\
&(3), z(-T) = z_0 \Rightarrow \exists s \in [-T, 0], z(s) \in \mathcal{L}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Standard HJ formulations exist for computing the BRS in the full dimensionality n [3], [5], [6], [7]. In addition,

¹A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between two measurable spaces (X, Σ_X) and (Y, Σ_Y) is said to be measurable if the preimage of a measurable set in Y is a measurable set in X , that is: $\forall V \in \Sigma_Y, f^{-1}(V) \in \Sigma_X$, with Σ_X, Σ_Y σ -algebras on X, Y .

special HJ formulations can be used to substantially reduce computation complexity for systems with special properties such as having terminal integrators or having fully decoupled dynamics [20], [21]. The goal of this paper will be to demonstrate how to take advantage of previous work on BRS computation for systems of particular forms, even when the actual system dynamics do not exactly satisfy necessary assumptions. For concreteness, in this paper we will focus on removing coupling to put systems into a fully decoupled form that satisfies the assumptions in [21].

Our proposed approach computes an approximation of the BRS in dimension $\max(n_x, n_y)$ instead of in dimension n , dramatically reducing computation complexity. This is done by removing coupling in the dynamics by treating certain variables as disturbances. The computed approximation can be chosen to be an over-approximation or an under-approximation of the true BRS.

III. SUMMARY OF FULL AND DECOUPLED HJ FORMULATIONS

Given the system in (1), the BRS $\mathcal{V}(t)$ defined in (4) can be computed using the following terminal value HJ PDE:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t V(t, z) + \min\{0, \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{d \in \mathcal{D}} D_z V(t, z) \cdot f(z, u, d)\} &= 0 \\
V(0, z) &= l(z)
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In (5), the target set $\mathcal{L}$ is represented as the sub-zero level set of the function $l(z)$: $\mathcal{L} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : l(z) \leq 0\}$. The BRS $\mathcal{V}(T)$ is represented as the viscosity solution of (5) $V(t, z)$: $\mathcal{V}(t) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(t, z) \leq 0\}$ [5], [22]. The definition given in (4) assumes that the control u tries to restrict the BRS from expanding as much as possible, and the disturbance d tries to do the opposite. Similar definitions of the BRS, for example one in which the control tries to maximize its growth, can be computed by adjusting the inner minimum and maximum. For simplicity, we will assume that the BRS is defined by (4), and thus determined by solving $V(t, z)$ given in (5). The computation complexity of solving (5) is $O(k^n T)$, where k is the number of grid points used in each dimension in the state space discretization and T is the length of the time horizon.

In the case that the system is fully decoupled, [21] provides a method to exactly compute $V(t, z)$. The computation is done in each of the decoupled components, substantially reducing computation complexity as long as the system is decoupled. A system (1) is a decoupled system if it can be split into N components, denoted $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ where $z = (x_1, \dots, x_N), x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$. Each component satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i &= f_i(x_i, u_i, d_i) \\
t &\in [-T, 0] \\
u_i &\in \mathcal{U}_i \\
d_i &\in \mathcal{D}_i \\
i &= 1, \dots, N
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For a system in the form of (6), the HJ PDE (5) can be solved in each decoupled component in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, z) &= \max_i V_i(\bar{t}(z), x_i) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{F}_1(t) \\ V(t, z) &= \max_i V_i(t, x_i) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{F}_2(t) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $V_i(t, x_i), i = 1 \dots, N$ are the viscosity solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} D_t V_i(t, x_i) + \max_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i} \min_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}_i} D_{x_i} V_i(t, x_i) \cdot f_i(x_i, u_i, d_i) &= 0 \\ V_i(0, x_i) &= l_i(x_i), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$\mathcal{F}_1(t)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(t)$ and given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1(t) &= \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{d \in \mathcal{D}} D_z V(t, z) \cdot f(z, u, d) > 0\} \\ \mathcal{F}_2(t) &= \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{d \in \mathcal{D}} D_z V(t, z) \cdot f(z, u, d) \leq 0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and $\bar{t}(z) = \inf_{\tau > t} \{z \in \mathcal{F}_1(\tau)\}$

With the decoupled formulation, the computation complexity of computing the BRS for a system of the form (6) is $O(k^{\max_i n_i} T)$. This substantial complexity reduction from the $O(k^n T)$ complexity of the full formulation also does not affect the optimality of the solution.

IV. COUPLING AS DISTURBANCE

The decoupled formulation summarized in Section III enables the exact computation of n dimensional BRSs in the space of the n_i dimensional decoupled components. However, this substantial computation benefit can only be gained if the system dynamics satisfies (6).

In the case where the dynamics are in the form of (3), the decoupled formulation cannot be directly used. However, if one treats y as a disturbance in the function g , and x as a disturbance in the function h , the system would become decoupled. Mathematically, (3) becomes the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \hat{g}(x, y_d, u_x, d_x) \\ \dot{y} &= \hat{h}(y, x_d, u_y, d_y) \\ t &\in [-T, 0] \\ x_d &\in \mathcal{X}, y_d \in \mathcal{Y} \\ u_x &\in \mathcal{U}_x, u_y \in \mathcal{U}_y \\ d_x &\in \mathcal{D}_x, d_y \in \mathcal{D}_y \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ represent the domain over which computation is done. By treating the coupled variables as a disturbance, we have uncoupled the original system dynamics (3), and produced an approximate dynamics (10) that is decoupled. More concretely, (3) becomes in the form of (10) if we make the substitutions

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= x \\ x_2 &= y \\ u_1 &= u_x \\ u_2 &= u_y \\ d_1 &= (y_d, d_x) \\ d_2 &= (x_d, d_y) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

This allows us to perform computation on the approximate dynamics (10) using the decoupled HJ formulation (7), (8), and (9), trading computation complexity for optimality.

Compared to the origin system dynamics given in (3), the uncoupled dynamics given in (10) experiences a larger disturbance, since the y dependence of the function g and the x dependence on the function h are treated as disturbance. With the definition of BRS in (4) the approximate BRS computed using the dynamics (10) is an over-approximation of the true BRS. We formalize this in the proposition below.

Proposition 1: Let the target set be represented by the implicit surface function $l(x, y)$, where $l(x, y) = \max\{l_x(x), l_y(y)\}$ for some l_x, l_y that represent the x and y components of the target set. Let $V(t, x, y)$ denote the viscosity solution to (5) with state $z = (x, y)$, target set $l(x, y)$, and dynamics $f = [g \ h]^T$ given in (3).

Let $\hat{V}(t, x, y)$ denote the value function computed using the decoupled formulation in (7), (8), and (9), with state $z = (x, y)$, target set $l(x, y)$, and dynamics $\hat{f} = [\hat{g} \ \hat{h}]^T$ given in (10). Then, $\hat{V}(t, x, y) \leq V(t, x, y) \forall t \in [-T, 0], x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Proof: Observe that (10) is a decoupled system, so by the results of [21], $\hat{V}(t, x, y)$ is also the viscosity solution to (5) with state $z = (x, y)$ and dynamics $\hat{f} = [\hat{g} \ \hat{h}]^T$ given in (10). It remains, then, to compare f and $\hat{f}$.

Rearranging (5) and writing $z = (x, y)$, we have, with dynamics f given in (3)

$$\begin{aligned} D_t V(t, x, y) &= -H(x, y, D_{(x,y)} V(t, x, y)) \\ V(0, x, y) &= l(x, y) \\ H(x, y, p) &= \min\{0, \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{d \in \mathcal{D}} p \cdot f(x, y, u, d)\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $u = (u_x, u_y)$ and $d = (d_x, d_y)$.

With the dynamics $\hat{f}$ given in (10), we instead have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t \hat{V}(t, x, y) &= -\hat{H}(x, y, D_{(x,y)} \hat{V}(t, x, y)) \\ \hat{V}(0, x, y) &= l(x, y) \\ \hat{H}(x, y, p) &= \min\{0, \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{\hat{d} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} p \cdot \hat{f}(x, y, u, \hat{d})\} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $u = (u_x, u_y)$, $\hat{d} = (x_d, y_d, d_x, d_y) = (x_d, y_d, d)$, and $\hat{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

The only difference between (12) and (13) is the Hamiltonians H and $\hat{H}$. Rewriting the Hamiltonian in (13) to show (x_d, y_d) explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}(x, y, D_{(x,y)} \hat{V}(t, x, y)) &= \\ \min \left\{ 0, \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \min_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \min_{x_d \in \mathcal{X}, y_d \in \mathcal{Y}} \left\{ \right. \right. & \\ \left. \left. D_{(x,y)} \hat{V}(t, x, y) \cdot \hat{f}(x, y, u, d, (x_d, y_d)) \right\} \right\} & \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Notice that if $x_d = x, y_d = y$, then

$$H(x, y, D_{(x,y)}V(t, x, y)) = \hat{H}(x, y, D_{(x,y)}\hat{V}(t, x, y)).$$

However, since the expression for $\hat{H}$ involves minimizing over (x_d, y_d) , we have that $\hat{H}(x, y, p) \leq H(x, y, p) \forall x, y, p$. Therefore, from (13) and (12), we have $D_t V(t, x, y) \leq D_t \hat{V}(t, x, y)$. Since we have that $V(0, x, y) = \hat{V}(0, x, y) = l(x, y)$, we must have $\hat{V}(t, x, y) \leq V(t, x, y) \forall t \in [-T, 0]$. ■

By treating the coupled states as disturbance, the computation complexity reduces from $O(k^n T)$ for the full formulation to $O(k^{\max\{n_x, n_y\}} T)$ for the decoupled approximate system (10).

V. DISTURBANCE SPLITTING

By treating coupling variables y and x as disturbances in g and h , respectively, we introduce conservatism in the BRS computation. This conservatism is always an over- or under-approximation depending on the desired direction of conservatism. In situations where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are large, the degree of conservatism can be reduced by splitting the disturbance x_d and y_d into multiple sections, as long as the target set $\mathcal{L}$ does not depend on the state variables being split. For example, $x_d \in \mathcal{X}$ can be split as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_d^i &\in \mathcal{X}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, M \\ \text{where } \bigcup_{i=1}^M \mathcal{X}_i &= \mathcal{X} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

This disturbance splitting results in the following family of approximate system dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= g(x, y_d, u_x, d_x) \\ \dot{y} &= h(y, x_d^i, u_y, d_y) \\ t &\in [-T, 0] \\ x_d^i &\in \mathcal{X}^i, y_d \in \mathcal{Y} \\ u_x &\in \mathcal{U}_x, u_y \in \mathcal{U}_y \\ d_x &\in \mathcal{D}_x, d_y \in \mathcal{D}_y \\ i &= 1, 2, \dots, M_x \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

from which a backwards reachable set can be computed in $\mathcal{X}^i \times \mathcal{Y}$. Since $\mathcal{X}^i \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, the degree of conservatism of the reachable set is reduced whenever the disturbance is split into M_y , for a total of $M = M_x M_y$ total “pieces” of uncoupling disturbances. In addition, the uncoupling disturbance y_d can also be split, further reducing conservatism. This reduction in the conservatism comes at a slight computation cost: the computation complexity in this case becomes $O(k^{\max\{n_x, n_y\}} T M)$. This is still much preferable to the $O(k^n T)$ complexity of the full formulation due to the exponential complexity scaling with respect to k , the number of grid points per dimension.

A. Examples of Decoupling System Dynamics

Our proposed method applies to any system of the form (3), as we will demonstrate with the example in Section (VI). Systems with light coupling between groups of state variables are particularly suitable for the application of our proposed method. Below are example systems for which treating the coupling variables y in g or x in h as disturbances would lead to decoupling.

Linear systems with large Jordan blocks, for example,

$$\dot{z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} z + Bu \quad (17)$$

If the z_3 is treated as a disturbance in the equation for $\dot{z}_2$, then we would obtain the two decoupled components (z_1, z_2) and (z_3, z_4) .

Constant Altitude Plane Model:

$$\dot{z} = \begin{bmatrix} z_4 \cos(z_3) \\ z_4 \sin(z_3) \\ u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where z_1 and z_2 are the x and y positions, respectively, z_3 is the heading angle, z_4 is the longitudinal speed, and u_1 and u_2 are the turn rate and longitudinal acceleration, respectively. As we will show in Section (VI), treating z_4 as a disturbance in the $\dot{z}_1$ equation and z_3 as a disturbance in the $\dot{z}_2$ equation will result in the decoupled components (z_1, z_3) and (z_2, z_4) .

Lateral Quadrotor Dynamics near Hover [23]:

$$\dot{z} = \begin{bmatrix} z_2 \\ g \tan z_3 \\ z_4 \\ -d_0 z_3 - d_1 z_4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ n_0 \end{bmatrix} u \quad (19)$$

where z_1 is the longitudinal position, z_2 is the longitudinal velocity, z_3 is the pitch angle, z_4 is the pitch rate, and u is the desired pitch angle. These dynamics are valid for small pitch angles. The system would become decoupled into the (z_1, z_2) and (z_3, z_4) components if z_3 is treated as a disturbance in $\dot{z}_2$. In fact, the full 10D quadrotor dynamics given in [23] can be decomposed into five decoupled components of 2D systems, allowing an approximation of the 10D reachable set to be computed in 2D space.

Although not considered in this paper, it is worth noting that after decoupling the 4D system in (19) into two 2D systems, each decoupled component is actually in the form $\dot{y} = g(y, u), \dot{x} = b(y)$. This is exactly the form of the dynamics in [20], allowing the 4D reachable set to be computed exactly in 1D!

In general, removing coupling by treating state variables as disturbances may bring the system dynamics into a form that is suitable for analysis using methods that require specific assumptions on the dynamics, potentially greatly reducing computation complexity.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We demonstrate our proposed method using a 4D model of an aircraft flying at constant altitude, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{p}_x &= v \cos \psi \\ \dot{p}_y &= v \sin \psi \\ \dot{\psi} &= \omega \\ \dot{v} &= a \\ |\omega| &\leq \bar{\omega}, \underline{a} \leq a \leq \bar{a}\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

where (p_x, p_y) represent the plane's position in the x and y direction, ψ represents the plane's heading, and v represents the plane's longitudinal velocity. The plane has a limited turn rate ω and a limited longitudinal acceleration a as its control variables. For our example, the computation bounds are

$$\begin{aligned}-40 \text{ m} &\leq p_x \leq 40 \text{ m} \\ -40 \text{ m} &\leq p_y \leq 40 \text{ m} \\ -\pi \text{ rad} &\leq \psi \leq \pi \text{ rad} \\ 6 \text{ m/s} &\leq v \leq 12 \text{ m/s}\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

Using the decoupled approximation technique, we create the following decoupled approximation of the system with (p_x, ψ) and (p_y, v) as the decoupled components:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{p}_x &= d_v \sin(\psi) \\ \dot{\psi} &= \omega \\ \omega &\leq |\bar{\omega}| \\ \underline{d}_v &\leq d_v \leq \bar{d}_v \\ \dot{p}_y &= v \sin(d_\psi) \\ \dot{v} &= a \\ \underline{a} &\leq a \leq \bar{a} \\ \underline{d}_\psi &\leq d_\psi \leq \bar{d}_\psi\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

We define the target set as a square of length 2 centered at $(p_x, p_y) = (0, 0)$, described by $\mathcal{L} = \{(p_x, p_y, \psi, v) : |p_x|, |p_y| \leq 2\}$. This can be interpreted as an “unsafe” area centered at the origin that must be avoided for all angles and velocities within the computation bounds. From the target set, we define $l(z)$ such that $l(z) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathcal{L}$. To analyze our newly decoupled system we must likewise decouple the target set by letting $\mathcal{L}_i, i = 1, 2$ be the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_1 &= \{(p_x, \psi) : |p_x| \leq 2\} \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= \{(p_y, v) : |p_y| \leq 2\}\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

These target sets have corresponding implicit surface functions $l_i(x_i), i = 1, 2$, which then form the 4D target set represented by $l(z) = \max_i l_i(x_i), i = 1, 2$.

We set $\mathcal{L}$ as the target set in our reachability problem and computed the BRS $\mathcal{V}(T)$ from $\mathcal{L}$ using both the direct 4D computation as well as the proposed decoupled approximation method.

A. Backwards Reachable Sets

The BRS describes in this case the set of initial conditions from which there is a possibility one would fall into the target set after a given time period T . Outside of the BRS the system is guaranteed to stay outside of the target set over a duration of T despite worst possible disturbances. To analyze the BRS we vary the degree of conservatism using the coupling splitting method described in V. After applying splitting, we arrive at the following piece-wise system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{p}_x &= d_v^i \sin(\psi) \\ \dot{\psi} &= \omega \\ \omega &\leq |\bar{\omega}| \\ \underline{d}_v^i &\leq d_v^i \leq \bar{d}_v^i \\ i &= 1, 2, \dots, M_v \\ \dot{p}_y &= v \sin(d_\psi^j) \\ \dot{v} &= a \\ \underline{a} &\leq a \leq \bar{a} \\ \underline{d}_\psi^j &\leq d_\psi^j \leq \bar{d}_\psi^j \\ j &= 1, 2, \dots, M_\psi\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

We analyzed the decoupled approximation formulation with M_v and M_ψ ranging from 1 to 32. To visually depict the computed 4D BRS, we plot 3D slices of the BRS in Fig. 1. In these slices the green sets are the BRS computed using the full formulation, and the gray sets are the decoupled approximations.

The top row of plots show the 3D slice at $v = 9.5$ m/s. The bottom row of plots show the 3D slice at $\psi = 2$ rad. Moving from left to right, each column of plots show the decoupled approximations with an increasing number of split sections M_v and M_ψ . The decoupled approximations become less conservative and more accurate as M_v and M_ψ increase.

With the definition of BRS given in (4), all the decoupled approximations are made over approximations. From a collision-avoidance point of view, we over-approximate the set of initial conditions that one must avoid in order to not crash into the target set.

B. Reconstruction Performance

To compare the degree of conservatism of the decoupled approximations, we determined the total 4D volume of the BRS computed using both methods. We then took the ratio of the decoupled approximation volume to the full formulation BRS volume. Since over-approximations are computed, a higher volume ratio indicates a higher degree of conservatism.

Fig. 2 shows this volume ratio as a function of M_v and M_ψ . For example, the purple curve represents the volume ratio for $M_\psi = 1$ across various values of M_v , and on the other extreme, the yellow curve represents the the volume ratio for $M_\psi = 32$ across various values of M_v . The highest number of sections computed was with $M_v = M_\psi = 32$. The volume ratio for this approximation was 1.29, meaning




Fig. 1: 3D slices of the target sets across a range of M_v and M_ψ . The full formulation sets are in green, and the decoupled approximation sets are in gray. The top row shows 3D slices at $v = 9.5$ m/s. The top left plot shows this slice for $M_\psi = M_v = 1$ with M_ψ, M_v increasing as we move right in the list of plots, up to $M_\psi = M_v = 32$ at top right. The bottom figures show 3D slices at $\psi = 2$ rad, with $M_\psi = M_v = 1$ at the bottom left up to $M_\psi = M_v = 32$ at the bottom right. As M_ψ and M_v increase, the conservatism reduces and the accuracy increases.




Fig. 2: Ratio of decoupled approximation volume to full 4D formulation volume for different numbers of M_ψ and M_v split sections. As more sections are added the sets become more accurate and less conservative.

that the decoupled approximation had a volume that is 129% of the volume of BRS computed using the full formulation.

C. Computation Time Performance

In Fig. 3 we compare the computation time of the two methods as a function of the number of grid points in each dimension. The full formulation (yellow curve) can only be computed up to 80 grid points in each dimension without taking multiple days to complete and running out of memory

on a 2015 MacBook Pro. The decoupled approximation is orders of magnitude faster than the full formulation, and therefore can be done with many more grid points in each dimension.

For the decoupled approximation we graphed the computation times for $M_\psi = M_v = 8$, since this is where the volume ratio begins to level off. We reconstructed the decoupled approximation on the entire 4D computation domain up to 160 grid points in each dimension, after which we ran out of memory (red curve). However, the decoupled approximation can still be computed for even more grid points, since the decoupled formulation allows for value function computation at arbitrary subsets of the computation domain. Therefore, we can compute the 2D components of the decoupled approximation up to much higher numbers of grid points (blue curve). The computation time increase due to choosing a larger reconstruction domain is minimal compared to the original full formulation. In both the case where full reconstruction is done and where only the 2D components are computed, the computation time is orders of magnitude lower than the full 4D computation.

In general we recommend computing the value function in only a region near a state of interest. Without full reconstruction of the value function, we are able to obtain results with many more grid points (blue curve), improving the accuracy of the computation on a numerical numerical.




Fig. 3: Computation time as a function of the number of grid points in each dimension. The full formulation (yellow curve) is orders of magnitude slower than the decoupled approximation. The decoupled approximation with reconstruction (red curve) is not significantly slower than the decoupled approximation without reconstruction (blue curve), but does run into memory issues after 160 grid points in each dimension.




Fig. 4: Computation time to compute decoupled approximation sets without reconstruction as a function of M_v and M_ψ . As the number of sections increases, the computation time increases approximately linearly.

In Fig. 4 we compare the computation time of the 2D computations in the decoupled approximation as a function M_v and M_ψ . Each line of the graph represents the computation time for a fixed number of M_ψ across various values of M_v . As the number of sections increases, the computation time required increases approximately linearly, as expected.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Hamilton-Jacobi reachability analysis can provide safety and performance guarantees for many practical systems, but the curse of dimensionality limits its application to systems with less than approximately five state variables. By treating state variables as disturbances, key state dependencies in the system dynamics can be eliminated, reducing the system dynamics to a simpler form and allowing reachable sets to be calculated conservatively using available efficient methods in the literature. Future work includes exploring methods to reduce conservatism, improve computation scalability, and practical implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Varaiya, "On the existence of solutions to a differential game," *SIAM Journal on Control*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 153–162, 1967.
- [2] L. C. Evans and P. E. Souganidis, "Differential games and representation formulas for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations," *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 773–797, 1984.
- [3] E. Barron, "Differential Games with Maximum Cost," *Nonlinear analysis: Theory, methods & applications*, pp. 971–989, 1990.
- [4] C. J. Tomlin, J. Lygeros, and S. S. Sastry, "A game theoretic approach to controller design for hybrid systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 88, no. 7, pp. 949–970, July 2000.
- [5] I. Mitchell, A. Bayen, and C. Tomlin, "A time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of reachable sets for continuous dynamic games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 947–957, July 2005.
- [6] O. Bokanowski, N. Forcadell, and H. Zidani, "Reachability and minimal times for state constrained nonlinear problems without any controllability assumption," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, pp. 1–24, 2010.
- [7] J. F. Fisac, M. Chen, C. J. Tomlin, and S. S. Shankar, "Reach-avoid problems with time-varying dynamics, targets and constraints," in *18th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Controls*, 2015.
- [8] J. Ding, J. Sprinkle, S. S. Sastry, and C. J. Tomlin, "Reachability calculations for automated aerial refueling," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Cancun, Mexico, 2008.
- [9] M. Chen, Q. Hu, C. Mackin, J. Fisac, and C. J. Tomlin, "Safe platooning of unmanned aerial vehicles via reachability," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2015.
- [10] A. M. Bayen, I. M. Mitchell, M. Oishi, and C. J. Tomlin, "Aircraft autoland safety analysis through optimal control-based reach set computation," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2007.
- [11] H. Huang, J. Ding, W. Zhang, and C. Tomlin, "A differential game approach to planning in adversarial scenarios: A case study on capture-the-flag," in *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2011 IEEE International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 1451–1456.
- [12] Jointed Planning and Development Office (JPDO), "Unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) comprehensive plan – a report on the nation's UAS path forward," Federal Aviation Administration, Tech. Rep., 2013.
- [13] Amazon.com, Inc. (2016) Amazon prime air. [Online]. Available: <http://www.amazon.com/b?node=8037720011>
- [14] BBC Technology. (2016) Google plans drone delivery service for 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-34704868>
- [15] AUVSI News. (2016) Uas aid in south carolina tornado investigation. [Online]. Available: <http://www.auvsi.org/blogs/auvsi-news/2016/01/29/tornado>
- [16] National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2016) Challenge is on to design sky for all. [Online]. Available: <http://www.nasa.gov/feature/challenge-is-on-to-design-sky-for-all>
- [17] I. M. Mitchell and C. J. Tomlin, "Overapproximating reachable sets by hamilton-jacobi projections," *Journal of Scientific Computing*, vol. 19, no. 1-3, pp. 323–346, 2003.
- [18] J. S. McGrew, J. P. How, L. Bush, B. Williams, and N. Roy, "Air combat strategy using approximate dynamic programming," *AIAA Guidance, Navigation, and Control Conference*, Aug 2008.
- [19] J. B. Lasserre, D. Henrion, C. Prieur, and E. Trélat, "Nonlinear optimal control via occupation measures and lmi-relaxations," *SIAM Journal Control and Optimization*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1643–1666, June 2008.
- [20] I. M. Mitchell, "Scalable calculation of reach sets and tubes for nonlinear systems with terminal integrators: A mixed implicit explicit formulation," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, 2011, pp. 103–112.
- [21] M. Chen and C. J. Tomlin, "Exact and efficient hamilton-jacobi reachability for decoupled systems," in *54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, December 2015.
- [22] M. G. Crandall and P.-L. Lions, "Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 277, no. 1, pp. 1–42, 1983.
- [23] P. Bouffard, "On-board model predictive control of a quadrotor helicopter: Design, implementation, and experiments," Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2012.